Submitted to ApJ Letters
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1402.7076v1 [astro-ph.CO] 27 Feb 2014

THE MASS-INDEPENDENCE OF SPECIFIC STAR FORMATION RATES IN GALACTIC DISKS

Louis E. Abramson[1,*], Daniel D. Kelson[2], Alan Dressler[2], Bianca Poggianti[3], Michael D. Gladders[1], Augustus Oemler, Jr[2], and Benedetta Vulcani[4]

Submitted to ApJ Letters

ABSTRACT

The slope of the star formation rate/stellar mass relation (the SFR "Main Sequence"; SFR–M_*) is not quite unity: specific star formation rates (SFR/M_*) are weakly-but-significantly anti-correlated with M_*. Here we demonstrate that this trend may simply reflect the well-known increase in bulge mass-fractions – portions of a galaxy *not* forming stars – with M_*. Using a large set of bulge/disk decompositions and SFR estimates derived from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, we show that renormalizing SFR by *disk* stellar mass ($\mathrm{sSFR_{disk}} \equiv \mathrm{SFR}/M_{*,\mathrm{disk}}$) reduces the M_*-dependence of SF efficiency by ~ 0.25 dex per dex, erasing it entirely in some subsamples. Quantitatively, we find $\log \mathrm{sSFR_{disk}}$–$\log M_*$ to have a slope $\beta_{\mathrm{disk}} \in [-0.20, 0.00] \pm 0.02$ (depending on SFR estimator and Main Sequence definition) for star-forming galaxies with $M_* \geq 10^{10} M_\odot$ and bulge mass-fractions $B/T \lesssim 0.7$, generally consistent with a pure-disk control sample ($\beta_{\mathrm{control}} = -0.05 \pm 0.04$). That $\langle \mathrm{SFR}/M_{*,\mathrm{disk}} \rangle$ is (largely) independent of host mass for star-forming disks bears strongly on scenarios of galaxy evolution derived from any SFR–M_* relation, including: the principal manifestation of "mass quenching" (bulge growth); the constancy of the shape of the star-forming stellar mass function (uniform $d \log M_*/dt$, assuming disk-driven growth); and the degree to which dispersion in $\mathrm{SFR}(M_*, t)$ encodes diversity in star formation histories. Our results emphasize the need to treat galaxies as composite systems – not integrated masses – in observational and theoretical work.

1. INTRODUCTION

Considerable interest has been generated by the observation of a correlation between galaxy star formation rates (SFRs) and stellar masses (M_*). Seen from $z = 0$ to $z > 2$ (e.g., Brinchmann et al. 2004; Daddi et al. 2007; Wuyts et al. 2011), this SFR "Main Sequence" (SFMS) may encode fundamental information about the mechanisms driving galaxy evolution.

Uncontroversial is the fact that the SFMS has fallen monotonically since at least $z \sim 2$ (e.g., Noeske et al. 2007; Rodighiero et al. 2010; Whitaker et al. 2012). Observed at all $M_* \gtrsim 10^{10} M_\odot$, this phenomenon must contribute significantly to the precipitous decline in cosmic star formation seen over the same epoch (e.g., Lilly et al. 1996; Madau et al. 1996; Sobral et al. 2012).

However, while its gross evolution is increasingly well-understood, the slope and dispersion of the SFMS remain uncertain. Such uncertainty arises (at least) from dependencies on SFR indicators (e.g., Pannella et al. 2009, Figure 4), the definition of "star forming" (e.g., Salim et al. 2007, §7.5), and a lack of high-redshift data at moderate-to-low M_* (e.g., Whitaker et al. 2012, Figure 1).

Despite these issues, if its evolution reflects that of individual systems, the slope and dispersion of the SFMS, their time-dependence, and their interpretation have deep implications for pictures of galaxy growth. With the SFMS broadly reproducible in cosmological simulations (Kereš et al. 2005; Neistein & Dekel 2008; Lagos et al. 2011; Hopkins et al. 2013) and actively employed as a basis/constraint for evolutionary models (e.g., Peng et al. 2010; Leitner 2012; Behroozi et al. 2013), understanding such details is increasingly important.

Here we reinterpret the slope of the SFMS.

The SFMS is conveniently recast in terms of galaxies' *specific* star formation rates – $\mathrm{sSFR} \equiv \mathrm{SFR}/M_*$ – or fractional mass-growth per unit time. If constant in time, sSFR is the (inverse) M_* e-folding timescale.

The M_*-dependence of sSFR – the departure of the SFMS slope from unity – contains information about the "efficiency" of SF across the galaxy mass spectrum.[5] Typically, it is parametrized by the power-law index:

$$\beta \equiv \frac{d \log \mathrm{sSFR}}{d \log M_*}. \quad (1)$$

If all galaxies formed stars with equal efficiency, β would be identically zero. Observationally, β appears *close* to zero, permitting convenient approximations in evolutionary models (e.g., Peng et al. 2010); $\mathrm{sSFR}(t)$ is *nearly* independent of mass, so the entire star-forming population is *nearly* describable by a single number (absent significant dispersion at fixed M_*; see Section 6).

Yet, β is *not* zero. Many studies using SFR indicators from the UV through the radio have concluded that, above $10^{10} M_\odot$, $-0.6 \lesssim \beta \lesssim -0.1$ for $z \lesssim 2$ (Brinchmann et al. 2004; Salim et al. 2007; Karim et al. 2011; Whitaker et al. 2012, but cf. Pannella et al. 2009). Peng et al. (2010, Figure 1) and Whitaker et al. (2012,

[1] Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics and Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, The University of Chicago, 5640 S Ellis Ave, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
[2] The Observatories of the Carnegie Institution for Science, 813 Santa Barbara St, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA
[3] INAF-Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo Osservatorio 5, 35122 Padova, Italy
[4] Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (WPI), Todai Institutes for Advanced Study, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8582, Japan
* labramson@uchicago.edu; research conducted at The Carnegie Observatories.

[5] More direct parameterizations of "SF efficiency" relate SFR to a gas mass, but sSFR is *an* efficiency metric.

TABLE 1
QUANTITIES

Quantity	Unit	Source[a]	Comment / Definition
$r_{\rm disk}$	SDSS mag[b]	1	Disk absolute r magnitude k-corrected to $z = 0.1$
$(g-r)_{\rm (disk)}$	SDSS mag[b]	1	(Disk) rest-frame color k-corrected to $z = 0.1$
z	···	1	Galaxy redshift
$n_{\rm Sérsic}$	···	1	Global r-band Sérsic index
b/a	···	1	Global r-band axis ratio (1 - ellipicity)
$M_{*\rm (,disk)}$	$M_\odot$	2(3)	(Disk) stellar mass
SFR	$M_\odot\,{\rm yr}^{-1}$	2	Aperture-corrected star formation rate (median of PDF)
sSFR	${\rm yr}^{-1}$	2	Galaxy specific star formation rate (SFR/M_*)
$\rm sSFR_{disk}$	${\rm yr}^{-1}$	3	Disk-mass-normalized star formation rate (SFR/$M_{*,\rm disk}$)

[a] 1 – S11; 2 – $\rm B04_4$/$\rm B04_7$; 3 – Derived.
[b] Offsets to AB system are < 0.01 mag.

Figure 1) find β for blue galaxies to be very small (see Section 5), but that β is significantly negative for the global star-forming population seems secure.

The implication of $\beta < 0$ is that low-mass galaxies grow (logarithmically) faster than higher-mass contemporaries. Interesting on its own, this fact is important also because β informs two other key questions: Why has the shape of the star-forming stellar mass function remained unchanged since $z \sim 2$ (e.g., Ilbert et al. 2010; Tomczak et al. 2013)? What *stops* star formation?

Setting aside the mass function for now (see Section 5 and the extensive treatment of Peng et al. 2010) the question of what stops SF in galaxies nicely illustrates β's influence on SFMS-based evolutionary models.

In the $\beta \to 0$ limit, galaxy evolution is binary: systems are either star-forming – growing in lock-step with all other such objects – or not. An implication is that mechanisms taking galaxies from the first population into the second act quickly and operate across all M_*.

Conversely, if β is substantially negative (as is likely), galaxy evolution is more nuanced. A system's global SF efficiency changes with time, gradually falling as the galaxy grows. Absent environmental effects, "quenching" occurs over long timescales, leading to a different list of candidate causes.

Many mechanisms have been proposed which implicitly or explicitly account for the mass-dependence of sSFR, including virial-heating of the circumgalactic medium by dark matter halos (inducing "hot-mode" accretion) and AGN activity (e.g., Dekel & Birnboim 2004; Kereš et al. 2005; Croton et al. 2006; Croton & Farrar 2008; van de Voort et al. 2011). Such processes may be at work, but they are not directly coupled to the observables in sSFR–M_*, so hypotheses are complicated by uncertainties in linking these phenomena.

There is a deeper observational concern, however. sSFR = SFR/M_* (hence β) is biased, *prima facie*, as a description of SF as the numerator has essentially nothing to do with a significant part of the denominator – the bulge. Given the well-known correlation of bulge mass-fractions, B/T, with M_*, $\beta < 0$ is expected simply because ever smaller portions of a galaxy participate in SF, independent of the nature of the SF itself.

If sSFR–M_* is to add meaningfully to our knowledge of galaxy evolution, at a minimum, the extent to which β reflects changes in the quality of SF (*how*) versus the proportion of a galaxy contributing to it (*where*) must be understood. Large spectrophotometric surveys – such as the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS – York et al. 2000) – enable this.

Below, we demonstrate the importance of recognizing *where* SF occurs, showing that most-to-all of β can be erased simply by redefining "sSFR" using the mass in galactic disks.

2. DATA

We use data from the Seventh SDSS Data Release (DR7 – Abazajian et al. 2009), drawing SFRs and M_* from Brinchmann et al. (2004, hereafter B04),[6] and 2D bulge/disk decompositions from Simard et al. (2011, hereafter S11). Given their extensive past use, however, we analyze DR4-based B04 data – which use a different SFR calculation[7] – in paralel. Below, $\rm B04_4$ and $\rm B04_7$ refer respectively to DR4-/DR7-based measurements while "B04" refers to the original paper ($\rm B04_7$ lacks a standalone reference at present).

Both SFR and M_* assume a Kroupa (2001) initial mass function. B04 give these quantities as probability distributions. We adopt the median (total) values, but results are unchanged if the mean or mode is used instead.

Below, quantities describing disks are denoted by the (additional) subscript "$_{\rm disk}$". Quantities lacking this tag describe global galaxy properties. Table 1 lists all parameters and their sources; $(H_0, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = (70\ {\rm km\,s^{-1}\ Mpc^{-1}}, 0.3, 0.7)$ is assumed everywhere.

2.1. *Bulge/Disk Decompositions*

We use S11 "fixed n_b" fits, where $n_b \equiv 4$ is the Sérsic index of the bulge component. These are the appropriate two-component models for almost all sources (S11 §4.2), but results are qualitatively unaffected if "free n_b" models are used instead. We take disk and total g, r absolute magnitudes from the fits. Employing model-independent Petrosian magnitudes from the NYU Value Added Galaxy Catalog (Blanton et al. 2005) does little but reduce $M_{*,\rm disk}$ for blue disks (Section 4).

To avoid dust and S/N effects, we limit our analysis to face-on galaxies ($b/a \geq 0.8$) with well-measured disk fluxes (${\rm Err}(g,r)_{\rm disk} \leq 0.05$) and total masses ($M_* \geq 10^9 M_\odot$). We further restrict the SFMS samples (see Section 3) to galaxies requiring a two-component bulge+disk

[6] www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7/sfrs.html
[7] Known to overestimate SFR in quiescent galaxies; www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR4/Data/sfr_catalogue.html.



FIG. 1.— SFMS fits before/after $M_{*,\rm disk}$ re-normalization (*left*/*right*) using $\rm B04_4$/$\rm B04_7$ data (*top*/*bottom*). SFR/M_*– and SFR/$M_{*,\rm disk}$–M_* have slopes β, $\beta_{\rm disk}$, respectively. Pure-disk control SFR/M_*–M_* is also plotted (blue hatching). Grey denotes regions of possible sSFR bias; only data at $10^{10}M_\odot \le M_* \le 2\times M_{\rm SFG}^{0.9}$ (the 90$^{\rm th}$ M_*-percentile for pure-SF galaxies) were fit. Band widths denote 1-σ uncertainties.

model.[8] Relaxing these cuts affects $\beta_{\rm (disk)}$ less than other systematics, employing them ensures maximally accurate $M_{*,\rm disk}$, SFR, and meaningful disk-mass corrections.

2.2. *The Sample*

In total, 12669 systems common to DR4 and DR7 meet these criteria, with median $(z, M_*) = (0.08, 5.5\times10^{10}M_\odot)$. These include: "Pure-SF" (42%); "SF/AGN composite" (9%); "AGN" (6%); "LINER" (15%); and "Unclassifiable" galaxies (no detected emission; 28%).

Given the SDSS spectroscopic limit, this sample is roughly complete to $4\times10^{10}M_\odot$ for star-forming systems (assuming 90$^{\rm th}$-percentile color and redshift). However, SFR completeness – set by line-flux, spectral S/N, and broadband colors – is of greater concern since it can distort fits in the sSFR–M_* plane. Since photometric completeness is not an issue and SFR $\approx 1\,M_\odot\,{\rm yr}^{-1}$ is well-measured by B04, the data should be relatively unbiased above the corresponding SFMS mass, $M_* \approx 10^{10}M_\odot$ (sSFR $\ge 10^{-10}\,{\rm yr}^{-1}$). We perform all fits above this limit and derive statistics using $1/V_{\rm max}$ weighting.

Assuming average conditions (FWHM$_{\rm SDSS}\approx1\farcs4$) one seeing-element corresponds to 2.1 kpc at $z = 0.08$. This is much smaller than the average disk, so resolution issues should be insignificant.

2.3. *Calculation of Disk Masses*

We estimate $M_{*,\rm disk}$ empirically. First, we select a sample of disk-dominated systems – r-band bulge-to-total flux ratio $(B/T)_r \le 0.2$ – whose color and mass should largely reflect those of pure disks. We then calculate r-band mass-to-light ratios, $\Upsilon_r \equiv M_*/L_r$, and derive $\langle\log\Upsilon_r(g-r)\rangle$ by fitting a second-order polynomial. Using S11 disk g, r absolute magnitudes:

$$\log M_{*,\rm disk}/M_\odot = -0.4(r_{\rm disk}-r_\odot) + \langle\log\Upsilon_r(g-r)_{\rm disk}\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $r_\odot = 4.64$ (Blanton & Roweis 2007).

We then define:

$$\rm sSFR_{disk} \equiv SFR/\mathit{M}_{*,disk}. \quad (3)$$

This does not *formally* correspond to "the sSFR of the disk" as bulge or nuclear regions may contribute some SF, but to ease discussion and because such contributions should be small, we use "sSFR$_{\rm disk}$" instead of "$M_{*,\rm disk}$-normalized SFR" below.

We do this independently for $\rm B04_4$ (M_* from spectral fitting by Kauffmann et al. 2003) and $\rm B04_7$ (M_* from SED fitting). Median 1-σ uncertainty in M_* is 0.09 dex in both cases, and scatter in $\log\Upsilon_r(g-r)$ is 0.12/0.08 dex, respectively. Quality cuts ensure Err$(g-r)_{\rm disk} \le 0.07$ mag (the median is 0.03), so random errors in M_* and $M_{*,\rm disk}$ should be comparable. Formal 1-σ uncertainties in SFR are ~ 0.3 dex (either estimate) and therefore dominate.

3. RESULTS

Figure 1 summarizes our analysis. Here we plot fits to the SFMS in both $\log$sSFR–$\log M_*$ (left) and $\log$sSFR$_{\rm disk}$–$\log M_*$ space (right). Because the locus has no formal definition, we approximate the SFMS in 5 (non-independent) ways:

- **MS-ALL:** All galaxies with sSFR above SFMS–3σ (defined using $\rm B04_7$).
- **MS-NOAGN:** The same, excluding AGN, Composite, and LINER galaxies.

[8] P(NOT 2-component) < 0.32; S11 §4.2.1



FIG. 2.— As Figure 1, but showing data. Grey points are all galaxies, black the MS-SUPER sample. Fits are replotted from Figure 1. Dashes show 1-σ control data spread (points not plotted). Control and SFMS distributions agree well after $M_{*,\rm disk}$ re-normalization.

- **PURE-SF:** All pure-SF systems regardless of sSFR; excludes AGN-contaminated and Unclassified galaxies.
- **BLUE DISK:** All galaxies with $(g-r)_{\rm disk} \leq 0.6$ regardless of spectral type or sSFR.
- **MS-SUPER:** Intersection of all of the above; the purest, but smallest, sample.

Also overplotted are results for a "pure-disk" control sample (where sSFR = $\rm sSFR_{disk}$) composed of pure-SF systems well-fit by a single-disk profile.[9]

Three points are clear:

1. The slope, β, of sSFR–M_* is substantially steeper for the SFMS samples than for the pure-disk control (Figure 1*a,c*);
2. The slope, $\beta_{\rm control}$, of the pure-disk control is consistent with zero at the 1- to 2-σ level (as seen at $z \sim 1$ by Salmi et al. 2012);
3. After $M_{*,\rm disk}$ re-normalization, SFMS slopes, $\beta_{\rm disk}$, and intercepts are similar to – even consistent with – those of the pure-disk control (Figure 1*b,d*).

Quantitatively, we find $-0.43 \leq \beta \leq -0.24$ (consistent with results from Salim et al. 2007; Karim et al. 2011; Whitaker et al. 2012), but $-0.20 \leq \beta_{\rm disk} \leq 0.00$. (Spreads reflect data set and inter-sample variations.) This ~ 0.25 dex/dex enhancement is interesting in an absolute sense: it substantially (perhaps entirely) homogenizes mean SF efficiencies over more than a factor of 10 in M_*. But, it is the homogenization of galaxies spanning $0.1 \lesssim B/T \lesssim 0.7$ with pure disks ($\beta_{\rm control} = -0.05 \pm 0.04$) that suggests $M_{*,\rm disk}$ re-normalization is physically meaningful.

Statistical uncertainties in β and $\beta_{\rm disk}$ are ~ 0.02 dex per dex, derived from fits to 100 bootstrap resamplings of the data at $10^{10} M_\odot \leq M_* \leq 2 \times M_{\rm SFG}^{0.9}$ (the 90$^{\rm th}$ mass-percentile for pure-SF galaxies). Systematics are clearly dominant, with SFMS definition and SFR estimate both contributing at the $\Delta\beta_{\rm disk} \approx 0.06$–$0.10$ level (Section 4).

Figure 2 shows the data. Grey points represent all galaxies, black the MS-SUPER sample, constituting $\sim$ 60% of the SFR density in the local universe (MS-ALL comprises $\sim$ 90% of local SFRD). Two additional points are illustrated here: 1) Dispersion in the SFMS, $\sigma_{\rm MS}$, is substantial; 2) Pure disks move from the top of the sSFR–M_* relation to the middle of $\rm sSFR_{disk}$–M_*. We discuss $\sigma_{\rm MS}$ in Section 6, but (2) is further evidence that the $M_{*,\rm disk}$ correction is physically meaningful: not only is β pushed close to $\beta_{\rm control}$, but the original SFMS *distribution* is made to coincide with that of pure disks. Visually comparing the 1-σ control spread (dashed blue lines) to that of $\rm sSFR_{disk}(\mathit{M_*})$ emphasizes this point.

In sum, re-normalizing SFR by $M_{*,\rm disk}$ substantially (perhaps entirely) homogenizes SF efficiency in giant galaxies, placing bulge-dominated, $10^{11} M_\odot$ systems near the level of pure disks one-tenth as massive.

[9] P(NOT 2-component) ≥ 0.5 and $n_{\rm Sérsic} \leq 2$.

4. SYSTEMATICS

Once the SFMS is defined – itself a $\Delta\beta_{(\rm disk)} \sim 0.1$ effect (Figure 1) – two systematics affect $\beta_{\rm disk}$: $M_{*,\rm disk}$ calculation and SFR estimation.

$M_{*,\rm disk}$ is affected by bulge/disk decomposition and Υ_r calibration. Υ_r effects are comparable to statistical uncertainties. Using Petrosian magnitudes induces larger changes ($\Delta\beta_{\rm disk} = 0.08$; both data sets), but only for the BLUE DISK (and thus MS-SUPER) samples. Comparing S11-based $M_{*,\rm disk}$ to estimates derived from decompositions by Gadotti (2009, $N_{\rm gals} = 529$; SDSS-based, but more complex than S11) or Allen et al. (2006, $N_{\rm gals} = 770$; fit to independent Millennium Galaxy Catalogue imaging (Liske et al. 2003)), we find no trends larger than the scatter (~ 0.25 dex) at $M_* \geq 10^{10} M_\odot$. Hence, SFR systematics likely drive uncertainty in $\beta_{\rm disk}$.

Figure 2*a,c* illustrates this. The (substantial) changes between $\rm B04_4$ and $\rm B04_7$ – bi-modality at $M_* \gtrsim 10^{10} M_\odot$, increased dispersion – mainly reflect revised aperture corrections introduced after Salim et al. (2007) found $\rm B04_4$ to overestimate sSFR in quiescent galaxies. Using a common $M_{*,\rm disk}$, we find $\Delta\beta(\rm B04_4 - B04_7) \simeq 0.10$ for all SFMS samples. Swapping B04 SFRs for optical emission line estimates from the Padova-Millennium Galaxy and Group Catalogue (PM2GC – Calvi et al. 2011) (which require no color-based corrections), we find $\beta_{\rm disk}^{\rm PM2GC} = -0.18 \pm 0.08$ for galaxies with $(g-r)_{\rm disk} \leq 0.6$, consistent with the analogous $\beta_{\rm disk}$ obtained from $\rm B04_7$. Hence, given the $\rm B04_4/B04_7$ offsets, systematics in $\beta_{\rm disk}$ are likely ~ 0.1 dex/dex once the SFMS is defined.

5. IMPLICATIONS

We have identified a quantity that is roughly constant for star-forming galaxies at $M_* \geq 10^{10} M_\odot$: $\rm SFR/M_{*,disk}$. The implication is that SF efficiency *in the disks of* star-forming galaxies (even bulge-dominated ones) is largely-to-entirely independent of global galaxy properties (e.g., halo mass). This is qualitatively different from (if anticipated by) findings regarding uniform $\rm SFR/M_*$ in disk-dominated galaxies (Salmi et al. 2012), blue galaxies (likely *because* they are disk-dominated; see Section 1), and the correlation of B/T with position on the SFMS (Martig et al. 2009; Williams et al. 2010; Lang et al. 2014; Omand et al. 2014), which our measurement of $\beta_{\rm control} = 0$ supports.

Indeed, our results suggest that the suppression of SF efficiency with M_* due to bulge-growth is mostly superficial, caused by the association of "SF efficiency" with sSFR and the conflation of *where* and *how* SF occurs. That is, "mass-quenching" is "bulge-building", distinct from the processes that affect SF *where it occurs*. In this we echo Kennicutt et al. (1994).

Whether bulge-growth is predominantly secular (converting dynamically "cold" disk material through, e.g., bar-instabilities; Kormendy & Kennicutt 2004) or merger-driven (adding "hot" bulge material through interactions; Toomre & Toomre 1972) is beyond the scope of this paper, but future measurements of the *disk* stellar mass function for galaxies of different B/T – or indeed $\beta(z)$ – may shed light on this question. Regardless, future investigations of halo heating and/or AGN driven quenching (Section 1) might focus on the narrower question of how these mechanisms build/maintain bulges in healthy disks. (This and the previous point is refined in the next section.)

A third implication is worth noting. Since $z \sim 2$, the low-M_* slope of the star-forming stellar mass function has remained constant at $\alpha \approx -1.4$, yet $\beta < 0$ is reported over the same interval almost universally (see Section 1 for references). These are inconsistent observations (Peng et al. 2010): $\beta < 0$ implies α should steepen (dramatically) with time. Our results – if shown to hold at $z \lesssim 2$ – resolve this paradox by suggesting (again) that M_* is simply the wrong mass to use when defining β. The uniform $\rm SFR/M_{*,disk}$ displayed by galaxies of any M_* preserves α under the reasonable assumption that mass-growth is dominated by *in situ* SF.

6. THE WIDTH OF THE SFR MAIN SEQUENCE

So far, we have neglected dispersion in the SFMS, $\sigma_{\rm MS}$. Given $\rm B04_4$ data – where $\sigma_{\rm MS} \lesssim 0.3$ dex, consistent with formal errors (Figure 2) – this appears reasonable. However, $\rm B04_7$ and numerous other data sets (e.g., Salim et al. 2007; Oemler et al. 2013, PM2GC) suggest $\sigma_{\rm MS} \sim 0.4$–0.6 dex (i.e., peak-to-peak $\Delta\rm sSFR(M_*) \gtrsim 1$ order of magnitude), implying that the width of the SFMS is qualitatively and quantitatively important.

Qualitatively, as $\beta_{(\rm disk)} \approx 0$, $\sigma_{\rm MS} > 0$ is necessary to preserve diversity in star formation histories (SFHs) as independently suggested by, e.g., stellar population synthesis (Poggianti et al. 2013; at least when $M_*(t) \approx M_{*,\rm disk}(t)$). Contrasting (Peng et al. 2010, Figure 19) with Gladders et al. (2013, Figure 2) demonstrates the contrast between $(\beta, \sigma_{\rm MS}) = (0,0)$ and $(\beta, \sigma_{\rm MS}) \neq (0,0)$, respectively, in terms of SFH diversity.

Inversely, such dispersion quantitatively complicates the determination of SFHs based on SFMS evolution (Section 1): one must model $\sigma_{\rm MS}(M_*, t)$. How this could be done is unclear; data are scanty at $M_* \ll 10^{10} M_\odot$ and $z \gg 1$ – key parameter space when modeling Milky Way analogues – but, inferring from local measurements, $\sigma_{\rm MS}$ – and therefore its navigation – only become more important in this mass regime (Salim et al. 2007, §7.5).

Regardless, assuming it can be precisely estimated, interpreting $\sigma_{\rm MS}$ will remain a challenge. Different SFR indicators probe different timescales ($\sim 10^7$ vs. 10^8–10^9 yr for optical and UV/IR metrics, respectively), so ambiguity in the causes of $\sigma_{\rm MS}(t)$ (minor mergers/starbursts (Dressler et al. 2013; Abramson et al. 2013)? extended periods of increased gas accretion?) and thus its relevance to the "fundamental" $\dot{M}_*$ history of galaxies may persist. If so, the utility of the SFMS as a model for individual systems will remain questionable.

One can always imagine the opposite, however. If $\sigma_{\rm MS}$ is "truly" small (e.g., Salmi et al. 2012), our results suggest a quasi-identical SFH for all galactic disks (up to a scaling), with galaxy-to-galaxy variations coming from bulge-building or environmental developments. Future IFU/resolved spectroscopic studies of galaxies at all redshifts could shed substantial light on this issue.

In sum, the "$M_{*,\rm disk}$ correction" is surely not the end of the story. Though it homogenizes star-forming disks in hosts with a range in B/T – placing, e.g., M31 and M33 on more similar footing – quenched disks exist at all M_* which cannot be brought onto (some variant of) the SFMS. Other factors – bars, disk dynamics, halo heat-

ing, AGN activity, environment – must help pull these systems off the (flat) ridge-line defined by normal disks; the key point is that these processes may manifest themselves in the dispersion and not the slope of the SFMS.

7. SUMMARY

Simply re-normalizing SFR by *disk* stellar mass, $M_{*,\rm disk}$ can account for ~ 0.25 dex of declining sSFR per decade M_*, essentially removing the dependence of SF efficiency on galaxy mass for star-forming systems with blue disks (if not all star-forming galaxies). Besides suggesting "mass-quenching" is "bulge-building" – distinct from processes affecting SF in disks – our findings ease tension between the SFMS and the evolution of the stellar mass function, and reinforce two important points:

- "Understanding galaxy evolution demands the routine bulge–disk decomposition of the giant galaxy population at all redshifts," (Allen et al. 2006);
- Dispersion in SFR(M_*) likely reflects real diversity in SFHs and should not be ignored.

Upcoming IFU surveys (e.g., MaNGA; `www.sdss3.org/future/manga.php`) may constrain intrinsic spreads in SFR($M_{*(,\rm disk)}$) and thus mechanisms shaping SFHs. Regardless, SFR/$M_{*,\rm disk}$–M_* and B/T–M_* should serve as benchmarks for future theoretical models of galaxy evolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

L.E.A. thanks Dr. Ryan Quadri, as well as Daniel Masters and Sean Johnson for many helpful discussions.

Funding for the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (`www.sdss.org`) was provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the Japanese Monbukagakusho, and the Max Planck Society.

REFERENCES

Abazajian, K. N., Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., et al. 2009, ApJS, 182, 543
Abramson, L. E., Dressler, A., Gladders, M. D., et al. 2013, ApJ, 777, 124
Allen, P. D., Driver, S. P., Graham, A. W., et al. 2006, MNRAS, 371, 2
Behroozi, P. S., Wechsler, R. H., & Conroy, C. 2013, ApJ, 770, 57
Blanton, M. R., & Roweis, S. 2007, AJ, 133, 734
Blanton, M. R., Schlegel, D. J., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2005, AJ, 129, 2562
Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., White, S. D. M., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 1151
Calvi, R., Poggianti, B. M., & Vulcani, B. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 727
Croton, D. J., & Farrar, G. R. 2008, MNRAS, 386, 2285
Croton, D. J., Springel, V., White, S. D. M., et al. 2006, MNRAS, 365, 11
Daddi, E., Dickinson, M., Morrison, G., et al. 2007, ApJ, 670, 156
Dekel, A., & Birnboim, Y. 2004, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 743, The New Cosmology: Conference on Strings and Cosmology, ed. R. E. Allen, D. V. Nanopoulos, & C. N. Pope, 162–189
Dressler, A., Oemler, Jr., A., Poggianti, B. M., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, 62
Gadotti, D. A. 2009, MNRAS, 393, 1531
Gladders, M. D., Oemler, A., Dressler, A., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, 64
Hopkins, P. F., Keres, D., Onorbe, J., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Ilbert, O., Salvato, M., Le Floc'h, E., et al. 2010, ApJ, 709, 644
Karim, A., Schinnerer, E., Martínez-Sansigre, A., et al. 2011, ApJ, 730, 61
Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 341, 54
Kennicutt, Jr., R. C., Tamblyn, P., & Congdon, C. E. 1994, ApJ, 435, 22
Kereš, D., Katz, N., Weinberg, D. H., & Davé, R. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 2
Kormendy, J., & Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 2004, ARA&A, 42, 603
Kroupa, P. 2001, MNRAS, 322, 231
Lagos, C. D. P., Lacey, C. G., Baugh, C. M., Bower, R. G., & Benson, A. J. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 1566
Lang, P., Wuyts, S., Somerville, R., et al. 2014, ArXiv e-prints
Leitner, S. N. 2012, ApJ, 745, 149
Lilly, S. J., Le Fevre, O., Hammer, F., & Crampton, D. 1996, ApJ, 460, L1
Liske, J., Lemon, D. J., Driver, S. P., Cross, N. J. G., & Couch, W. J. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 307
Madau, P., Ferguson, H. C., Dickinson, M. E., et al. 1996, MNRAS, 283, 1388
Martig, M., Bournaud, F., Teyssier, R., & Dekel, A. 2009, ApJ, 707, 250
Neistein, E., & Dekel, A. 2008, MNRAS, 383, 615
Noeske, K. G., Weiner, B. J., Faber, S. M., et al. 2007, ApJ, 660, L43
Oemler, Jr., A., Dressler, A., Gladders, M. G., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, 61
Omand, C., Balogh, M., & Poggianti, B. 2014, ArXiv e-prints
Pannella, M., Carilli, C. L., Daddi, E., et al. 2009, ApJ, 698, L116
Peng, Y.-j., Lilly, S. J., Kovač, K., et al. 2010, ApJ, 721, 193
Poggianti, B. M., Calvi, R., Bindoni, D., et al. 2013, ApJ, 762, 77
Rodighiero, G., Cimatti, A., Gruppioni, C., et al. 2010, A&A, 518, L25
Salim, S., Rich, R. M., Charlot, S., et al. 2007, ApJS, 173, 267
Salmi, F., Daddi, E., Elbaz, D., et al. 2012, ApJ, 754, L14
Simard, L., Mendel, J. T., Patton, D. R., Ellison, S. L., & McConnachie, A. W. 2011, ApJS, 196, 11
Sobral, D., Best, P. N., Matsuda, Y., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 1926
Tomczak, A. R., Quadri, R. F., Tran, K.-V. H., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Toomre, A., & Toomre, J. 1972, ApJ, 178, 623
van de Voort, F., Schaye, J., Booth, C. M., & Dalla Vecchia, C. 2011, MNRAS, 415, 2782
Whitaker, K. E., van Dokkum, P. G., Brammer, G., & Franx, M. 2012, ApJ, 754, L29
Williams, R. J., Quadri, R. F., Franx, M., et al. 2010, ApJ, 713, 738
Wuyts, S., Förster Schreiber, N. M., van der Wel, A., et al. 2011, ApJ, 742, 96
York, D. G., Adelman, J., Anderson, Jr., J. E., et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1579